

DRAFT Minutes of the PUBLIC MEETING
of
THE ARIZONA OUTDOOR RECREATION
COORDINATING COMMISSION (AORCC)
of
THE ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD

Tuesday, July 27, 2010, beginning at 10:00 a.m.

State Parks Board Room, 1300 W. Washington St., Phoenix, Arizona

A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL @ 10:12am

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS AND STAFF

AORCC PRESENT: Jeff Bell, William Schwind, Renée Bahl, Karla Brady via teleconference

QUORUM IS PRESENT

ASP Staff Present: Dan Shein, Kent Ennis, Robert Baldwin

Public Present: Tom Bikauskas (BLM), Stacey Brechler-Knaggs & Martin Ince (City of Flagstaff via Teleconference)

C. ACTION ITEMS

1. Approval of Minutes from the April 12, 2010 Meeting.

Moved by Schwind, seconded by Bahl. No discussion. Motion carried unanimously.

2. Consider Approval of the Law Enforcement and Boating Safety Fund Allocation Percentage Changes Based on the 2009 Arizona Watercraft Survey and Recommend the Allocation of \$500,000 to La Paz and Mohave Counties –

Staff recommends that the AORCC approve the allocation percentages based on the 2009 Watercraft Survey to the eligible counties, and, that Mohave County be allocated \$314,200 and La Paz County be allocated \$185,800 from the LEBSF for fiscal year 2011.

Baldwin – Reviewed staff recommendation in AORCC packet.

Schwind moved to approve staff recommendation. Seconded by Brady.

Schwind – Observed that calculations appear logical.

Ennis – State Parks intends to process payment to the recipients in the fall, soon after approval by the Parks Board.

No other discussion. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Consider Staff Recommendation for Funding Recreational Trails Program Non-Motorized Projects - Staff recommends awarding \$361,118 to five projects.

Baldwin – Reviewed staff recommendation in AORCC packet.

Schwind – What was the response from the two project sponsors that did not request funds?

Baldwin – Prescott did not feel they were prepared to move forward with the project or prepare their request in time for this meeting. I did not get a response from Avondale. They had indicated in a previous quarterly report that their matching funds had dried up. That project never really got started.

Bikauskas – I work for the Phoenix District Office. The Black Canyon Trail project began in 1959. Approving these funds will allow us to complete trail services in addition to the trail. The funds will help provide parking access and we're very happy they were made available to us.

Ince, Trails Planner – Thank you for this opportunity. Our goal is to provide a planning system for the Flagstaff Urban Trail System (FUTS). The system concept was developed 50 years ago and as of this summer we have surpassed 50 miles of trails.

Schwind moved to accept staff recommendation. Seconded by Bahl. No further discussion. Motion carried unanimously.

D. REPORTS - Commission and staff reports may be written or verbal.

1. Parks Board Actions on AORCC Items – At the April 21, 2001 meeting the Parks Board directed State Parks to use the 2010 LEBSF for agency operations in 2011.

2. State Parks Budget Presentation and Operational Update

Ennis – Presented high-level PowerPoint overview of the actions taken at the June Parks Board Meeting to identify the budget through 2013. A synopsis of those actions was provided in your packet.

Page 12 – FY2009-2011 Fund Sweeps. The predominant influence on our budget has been the sweeps and diversions from our operating funds to the State general fund. In 2009 that amounted to about \$34.5 million. In 2010 that amount was almost \$23 million and in 2011 another \$14 million has been diverted. The legislature did approve a one-year use of the Law Enforcement and Boating Safety Fund (LEBSF) except for the \$500,000 that you just approved to go to La Paz and Mohave Counties. Our annual allocation of \$10 million from the Heritage Fund was not just suspended, but removed permanently. That will have a significant impact for not only State Parks, but also for our partners and stakeholders. Additionally, the sweep last year of \$213,000 from our donations fund that received significant publicity was reversed. However, they did proceed to take another \$19,000 from that fund this year.

Page 13 – Agency Revenues Comparisons FY2008 through FY2012. The figure in 2012 conservatively assumes the proposed legislation to transfer funds remaining in the Growing Smarter Land Acquisition fund will get passed in November. We certainly hope that doesn't happen. You can see from this chart that our resources have decreased for \$75 million to about \$25 million over these four years.

Page 14-15 – Key Operating Budget Assumptions for FY2011 Policy Issues.

Page 16. Key Operating Budget Assumption for FY2012-13. Eliminating the special line item for Kartchner Caverns does not increase the operating budget, but

it gives us some needed flexibility and it we cumbersome to maintain an extra set of books for Kartchner.

Page 17 – Projected FY2011 Agency Annual Allocated Expenditures.

Page 18 – Projected FY2011 Operating Expenditures by Program. The Administration portion includes agency wide expenses like rent, risk insurance contributions, gas, etc.

Page 19 – Projected FY2011 Operating Expenditures by Category. Since almost 70% of the budget is comprised of Personnel Services (salaries) and Employee Related Expenses (benefits), when we have the budget reductions we have to eliminate position as a major response.

Page 20 – Board Action Items.

Schwind – The taxes for the LEBSF are going away?

Ennis – No, this was only a legislative action to allow us to use the funds for one year. This is only temporary relief for our budget challenges. We are not planning on getting this in the future.

Schwind – How lengthy are the terms of the agreements you have with the other partners? How many parks are operating under those agreements?

Ennis – They are all different. Some are for a couple of years, but most are only for one year. We are currently operating nine parks under those agreements and may add another one. These partners have expressed how important these parks are to their economies and we hope the will find a way to continue their support.

Schwind – Do the agreements only deal with operation or do the get into any capital improvements?

Ennis – Specifically, operations.

3. New Communications Guidelines for State Parks Advisory Committees –
Staff will draft new guidelines to replace antiquated 1994 Memorandum of Understanding.

Shein – We are trying to streamline the processes that we use to communicate with all of our advisory committees and provide more timely information since things are changing so fast. We want to be sure any information that is intended for a specific committee gets shared with other committees that may have interest in it.

Bahl – Added that changes are needed since some of the funds that committees were established to oversee no longer exist.

- E. CALL TO THE PUBLIC** - During the public meeting; the Commission may afford any person the opportunity to present statements relating to agenda items, with or without the opportunity to present them orally. Those wishing to address the Commission must register at the door and be recognized by the Chair. Time permitting; each presentation will be given approximately five minutes. It is probable that each presentation will be limited to one person per organization.

Action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study or re-schedule the matter for further consideration at a later time.

No requests to speak.

F. SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS, MATTERS OF BOARD PROCEDURE, REQUESTS AND ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA

None.

G. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING - TBA

H. ADJOURNMENT – absent objection the meeting was adjourned @ 10:52 am

DRAFT